UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,348	09/14/2005	Eric Thelen	DE 030083	6705
	7590 11/03/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001 PDIA DCI HEE MANOR NV 10510			DUFFIELD, JEREMY S	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2427		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/549,348	THELEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JEREMY DUFFIELD	2427	

	OERCENIT BOTTIEEB	2721
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origiten than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bei	tter form for appeal by materially red	. , ,
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	·	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Scott Beliveau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427		

- Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regard to applicant's arguments that the given reference does not teach "the user-specific program...second terminal unit", Page 6, lines 17-19 and similar arguments on Page 9, lines 9-10, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Isozu teaches transmitting an audio/video stream to a terminal A, and after receiving a pause request, pausing the stream at the gateway. While paused, the stream destination address is changed to a terminal B and is subsequently transmitted to terminal B (Col. 5, lines 34-39; Col. 12, lines 4-36). This passage reads on the program content being adapted, i.e. destination address changed, before the continuation, i.e. while being paused at the gateway, of the transmission to the second terminal unit. The limitation states that the program and/or the program content are adapted...to the second terminal unit. The changing of the destination address of the program content to the second terminal unit.
- 2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., changing the program content, Page 7, lines 4-6) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).